

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

JOSHUA WAYNE BEVILL, §  
Petitioner, §  
§  
v. § No. 3:16-cv-3152-B (BT)  
§ No. 3:11-cr-082-B (BT)  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, §  
Respondent. §

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and an order of the District Court, this case has been referred to the United States Magistrate Judge. The findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge follow:

I.

Petitioner filed this petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2255. On January 26, 2018, the Court sent Petitioner an order notifying him that this case has been referred to the Magistrate Judge. On February 14, 2018, the Court's order was returned as undeliverable. Petitioner has not provided the Court with any alternative address.

II.

Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure allows a court to dismiss an action *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or for failure to comply with the federal rules or any court order. *Larson v. Scott*, 157 F.3d 1030, 1031 (5th Cir. 1998). “This authority [under Rule 41(b)] flows from the court’s inherent power to control its docket and prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending cases.” *Boudwin v. Graystone Ins. Co., Ltd.*, 756 F.2d 399, 401 (5th Cir. 1985) (citing *Link v. Wabash, R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626 (1962)). Petitioner has failed to provide the Court with a current address. Without a current address, the Court has no way to communicate with Petitioner, and this case cannot proceed. Accordingly, the petition for writ of habeas corpus should be dismissed for want of prosecution.

III.

The Court recommends that the petition for writ of habeas corpus be dismissed without prejudice for want of prosecution under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

Signed March 8, 2018.

  
REBECCA RUTHERFORD  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND  
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT**

A copy of the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of the findings, conclusions, and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. *See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b).* In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the Magistrate Judge's recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the Magistrate Judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge that are accepted or adopted by the District Court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Services Automobile Ass'n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).*